

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request consideration of the subject application as amended herein. This Amendment is submitted in response to the Non-Final Office Action mailed May 20, 2005. Claims 1, 3, 4, and 6-21 are rejected. In this amendment, claims 1, 11, and 15 have been amended. Claim 7 has been cancelled without prejudice.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1, 3, 4, 6, and 8-10, as amended, satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 101 and respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of the claims under § 101.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 8-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Fratkina, et al., (U.S. Patent Application No. 2001/0049688, hereinafter “Fratkina”). Applicant does not admit that Fratkina is prior art and reserves the right to swear behind the reference at a later date. Nonetheless, Applicant respectfully submits that Applicant’s invention as claimed in claims 1, 3-4 and 6-21 is not anticipated by Fratkina.

Claims 1, 3-4, 6-10

With regard to independent claim 1, Fratkina does not teach or suggest the claimed limitation of “loading a logical structure from a database, components of the logical structure comprising a logically linked set of questions to be presented to a user as part of a customer relationship management user interface...”

In contrast, Fratkina discloses that while the type of question to be generated can be specified by a dialog designer, the dialog engine generates the follow-up questions to the user in the process of resolving active goals. (Fratkina, page 20, ¶360). The dialog engine generates the questions by applying methods and algorithms to a knowledge map, by using dialog control information, and by using user's response to some initial questions. (Fratkina, page 1, ¶14). Thus, Fratkina does not teach or suggest loading questions from a database.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the invention claimed in claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 8-10 is not anticipated by Fratkina under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) and respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of the claims.

Claims 11-14

With regard to independent claim 11, as discussed above, Fratkina does not teach or suggest the claimed limitation of “load a logical structure from a database, components of the logical structure comprising a logically linked set of questions to be presented to a user as part of a customer relationship management user interface...”

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the invention claimed in claims 11-14 is not anticipated by Fratkina under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) and respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of the claims.

Claims 15-21

With regard to independent claim 15, Fratkina does not teach or suggest the claimed limitation of “a loader to load a definition associated with a logical structure from a storage location, components of the logical structure comprising a set of questions to be presented to

a user as part of a customer relationship management user interface,” because Fratkina discloses that the dialog engine generates the follow-up questions.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the invention claimed in claims 15-21 is not anticipated by Fratkina under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) and respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of the claims.

If the Examiner determines the prompt allowance of these claims could be facilitated by a telephone conference, the Examiner is invited to contact Marina Portnova at (408) 720-8300.

Deposit Account Authorization

Authorization is hereby given to charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any charges that may be due. Furthermore, if an extension is required, then Applicant hereby requests such extension.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR
& ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: August 22, 2005



Marina Portnova
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 45,720

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(408) 720-8300